

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending and under consideration. In the non-final Office Action of March 16, 2009, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Rejected Claims 1 - 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.
- B.) Rejected Claims 23 - 33 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
- C.) Rejected Claims 1-14 and 20-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Coulouris, et al. (Coulouris, Distributed Systems Concepts and Design, 2d. ed., Addison-Wesley, 1994)(“Coulouris”) in view of Fidge (Fidge, “Logical Time in Distributed Computing Systems,” Computer, Vol. 24, Issue 8, pp. 28-33, ISSN 0018-9162, August 1991)(“Fidge”).
- D.) Rejected Claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Coulouris in view of Fidge and further in view of Liedtke (Liedtke, “Improving IPC by Kernel Design,” ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles, Proceedings of the Fourteenth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, ACM Press, pp. 175-188, 1994)(“Liedtke”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

- A.) Rejection of Claims 1 - 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention:

Applicants have amended claims at issue by adding that “said at least one of said service calls corresponding to said changed thread,” thereby clarifying which of the service associated with the synchronization call are placed into a wait position.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

- B.) Rejection of Claims 23 - 33 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter:

The Specification has been amended on pages 21 and 51, paragraphs 3 and 1, respectively, by removing the disclosure related to the computer readable medium being a signal.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 1-14 and 20-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Coulouris* in view of *Fidge*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Claims 1, 12, 22, 23, 34, and 35 have been amended to clarify that at least one of the service calls associated with the synchronization call is placed into a wait position, the at least one of said service calls corresponding to the changed thread, when the number of service calls indicated in the synchronization call and the number of service calls executed at the client prior to receiving the synchronization call differ.

Independent claims 1, 12, 22, 23, 34, and 35, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to service calls that are generated by a plurality of threads at a server and received at a client. The client receives a synchronization call, which indicates that one of the threads executed at the server has changed and indicates a number of service calls generated by the threads at the server prior to the thread change. The synchronization call is a separate call from the service calls and is transmitted to the client to allow the client to synchronize a service call execution. The at least one of the service calls associated with the synchronization call, which corresponds to the changed thread, is placed into a wait position.

This is clearly unlike *Coulouris* in view of *Fidge*, which fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed at least one of the service calls associated with the synchronization call, which corresponds to the changed thread, is placed into a wait position. Nowhere does *Coulouris* disclose or suggest at least one of the service calls associated with the synchronization call, which corresponds to the changed thread, is placed into a wait position.

Thus, *Coulouris* fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed placing at least one of the service calls associated with the synchronization call, which corresponds to the changed thread, into a wait position.

Fidge also fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed placing at least one of the service calls associated with the synchronization call, which corresponds to the changed thread, into a wait position.

Thus, *Coulouris* in view of *Fidge* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claims 1, 12, 22, 23, 34, and 35.

Claims 2-11, 13-21, and 24-33 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 12, or 23 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 12, and 23 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

D.) Rejected claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Coulouris* in view of *Fidge* and further in view of *Liedtke*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claim 12 is allowable over *Coulouris* in view of *Fidge* as discussed above. *Liedtke* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed placing at least one of the service calls associated with the synchronization call, which corresponds to the changed thread, into a wait position. Therefore, *Coulouris* in view of *Fidge* and further in view of *Liedtke* still fails to disclose or suggest claim 12.

Claims 15-19 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 12 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

E. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 – 35 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

If the claims are not found to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to schedule an interview before the mailing of the Office Action. Any communication initiated by this paragraph should be deemed an Applicants' initiated interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 16, 2009

By: /Kader Gacem/

Kader Gacem
Patent Agent, Registration No. 52,474
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000